



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/735,206 | 12/12/2003 | James Kelly | C1120 | 1794 |

7590 04/27/2005
Donald Cayen
Suite 502
104 South Main Street
Fond du Lac, WI 54935

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

HSIEH, SHIH YUNG

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2837

DATE MAILED: 04/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

117

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/735,206 | Applicant(s) KELLY, JAMES | |
| | Examiner Shih-yung Hsieh | Art Unit 2837 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-62 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 31-34 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 8-10, 19, 20, 48 and 49 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 11-18, 21-30, 35-47 and 50-62 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/27/2004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

Art Unit: 2837

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mad-Max (applicant's IDS) in view of Garitano (2003/0017311).

Regarding claim 1, Mad-Max discloses the claimed invention except that a colorant of a selected color that imparts the selected color to the polymer material.

Garitano teaches a colorant of a selected color that imparts the selected color to the polymer material (page 7, 2nd col., line 5) for making musical items, including woodwind (page 9, 1st col., line 11). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Mad-Max's mouthpiece as taught by Garitano to include a colorant of a selected color that imparts the selected color to the polymer material for the purpose of making musical items.

Regarding claims 2 and 3, Mad-Max discloses the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 7, see above, and a brass wind instrument is an essential part for the mouthpiece to be inserted.

3. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mad-Max in view of Garitano as applied to claims 1 and 2 above, and further in view of Wean (4,658,697).

Art Unit: 2837

Regarding claim 4, Mad-Max in view of Garitano disclose the claimed invention except that the colorant material cooperate to render the mouthpiece transparent.

Wean teaches a transparent mouthpiece for training a student (abstract). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Mad-Max in view of Garitano's mouthpiece as taught by Wean to include the colorant material cooperate to render the mouthpiece transparent for the purpose of training a student.

4. Claims 5, 12, 13, 15, 17-18, 23, 41-42, 44, 46-47, 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mad-Max in view of Garitano as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Dolmetsch (3,750,521).

Regarding claims 5, and 41-42, Mad-Max in view of Garitano disclose the claimed invention except that the mouthpiece is manufactured by an injection molding process.

Dolmetsch teaches a mouthpiece (21) made by injection molding (col. 2, lines 19-20) for mass production. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Mad-Max in view of Garitano's mouthpiece as taught by Dolmetsch to include the mouthpiece being manufactured by an injection molding process for the purpose of mass production.

Regarding claims 12 and 15, see above.

Regarding claim 13, Mad-Max discloses the claimed invention.

Regarding claims 17, 18, 23, and 51, it is obvious that Mad-Max in view of Garitano and Dolmetsch obviously disclose the method steps of manufacturing a mouthpiece as claimed.

Regarding claim 44, Mad-Max discloses the claimed invention.

Regarding claims 46-47, Mad-Max discloses the steps of a. and b. (a design that replicates the traditional cup, throat, back bore and performance of brass mouthpiece...), and Mad-Max in view of Garitano and Dolmetsch obviously disclose the method steps as claimed.

5. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mad-Max in view of Garitano as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Disera (5,357,837).

Regarding claim 6, Mad-Max in view of Garitano disclose the claimed invention except that the mouthpiece is manufactured by machining a bar of polymer material.

Disera teaches a mouthpiece (20) being manufactured by machining (col. 3, lines 59-60). Further, it is known that machining an item such as mouthpiece is a known art. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Mad-Max in view of Garitano's mouthpiece as taught by Disera to include the mouthpiece being manufactured by machining a bar of polymer material for the purpose of manufacturing the mouthpiece.

6. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mad-Max in view of Garitano as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of the applicant's admission (page 1, lines 32-34).

Regarding claim 11, Mad-Max in view of Garitano disclose the claimed invention except that the polycarbonate material and the selected colorant material cooperate to render the mouthpiece a color that is gold or silver color, so that the mouthpiece color blends in with the first color.

The applicant admits that whatever the material, their colors were generally the same as the color of the instrument, i.e. gold or silver. The mouthpiece thus tended to blend into the instrument.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Mad-Max in view of Garitano's combination as taught by the applicant's admission to include the polycarbonate material and the selected colorant material cooperate to render the mouthpiece a color that is gold or silver color, so that the mouthpiece color blends in with the first color.

7. Claims 14, 43, and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mad-Max in view of Garitano and Dolmetsch as applied to claims 12, 41, and 50 respectively above, and further in view of Wean.

Regarding claims 14, 43, and 50, see above.

Art Unit: 2837

8. Claims 16 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mad-Max in view of Garitano and Dolmetsch as applied to claims 12 and 41 respectively above, and further in view of Getzen (4,754,682).

Regarding claims 16 and 45, Mad-Max in view of Garitano and Dolmetsch disclose the claimed invention except that the mouthpiece is further manufactured by a secondary machining process subsequent to removing the mouthpiece from the molds.

Getzen teaches a mouthpiece is further manufactured by a secondary machining process subsequent to removing the mouthpiece from the molds for providing a very accurate bore (col. 2, lines 20-24, and col. 4, lines 42-45).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Mad-Max in view of Garitano and Dolmetsch's mouthpiece as taught by Getzen to include that the mouthpiece is further manufactured by a secondary machining process subsequent to removing the mouthpiece from the molds for the purpose of providing a very accurate bore.

Further, Mad-Max's "the back bore is polished" is a secondary machining process.

9. Claims 21, and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mad-Max in view of Garitano and Dolmetsch as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Getzen.

Regarding claims 21, 24 and 25, see above.

Art Unit: 2837

10. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over over Mad-Max in view of Garitano and Dolmetsch as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Wean.

Regarding claim 22, see above.

11. Claims 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mad-Max in view of Garitano and Dolmetsch as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of the applicant's admission.

Regarding claim 26 and 27, see above.

12. Claims 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mad-Max in view of Garitano, Dolmetsch and Getzen.

Regarding claim 28, see above.

Regarding claim 29, Mad-Max in view of Garitano disclose the claimed invention.

13. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mad-Max in view of Garitano, Dolmetsch and Getzen as applied to claim 28 above, and further in view of Wean.

Regarding claim 30, see above.

14. Claims 35-36, 38, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mad-Max in view of Garitano, Dolmetsch and Getzen.

Regarding claims 35 and 36, it is obvious that Mad-Max in view of Garitano, Dolmetsch and Getzen disclose the method steps as claimed.

Regarding claim 38, see above.

Regarding claim 39, Mad-Max in view of Garitano disclose the claimed invention.

15. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mad-Max in view of Garitano, Dolmetsch as applied to claim 35 above, and further in view of Disera.

Regarding claim 37, see above.

16. Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mad-Max in view of Garitano, Dolmetsch and Getzen as applied to claim 36 above, and further in view of Wean.

Regarding claim 40, see above.

17. Claims 52 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mad-Max in view of Garitano and Dolmetsch as applied to claim 46 above, and further in view of the applicant's admission.

Regarding claims 52 and 53, see above.

18. Claim 54-55, and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mad-Max in view of Garitano and Disera.

Regarding claim 54, see above.

Regarding claims 55, see above.

Regarding claim 57, Mad-Max discloses the claimed invention.

19. Claim 56 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mad-Max in view of Garitano and Disera as applied to claim 54 above, and further in view of Wean.

Regarding claim 56, see above.

20. Claim 58-59, and 61-62 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mad-Max in view of Disera.

Regarding claim 58, Mad-Max disclose the claimed invention except that the step of providing a bar of a selected polymer material and machining the bar into a brass instrument mouthpiece.

Disera teaches a mouthpiece (20) being manufactured by machining (col. 3, lines 59-60). Further, it is known that machining an item such as mouthpiece is a known art. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Mad-Max's method of manufacturing a mouthpiece as taught by Disera to include the mouthpiece being manufactured by machining a bar of polymer material for the purpose of manufacturing the mouthpiece.

Regarding claims 59 and 61, Mad-Max discloses the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 62, see above.

Art Unit: 2837

21. Claim 60 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mad-Max in view of Disera as applied to claim 58 above, and further in view of Wean.

Regarding claim 60, see above.

22. Claims 8-10, 19-20, and 48-49 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

23. Claims 31-34 are allowed.

24. The claims are allowable over the prior art for at least the reason that the prior art fails to reasonably teach or suggest in claims 8, 19, and 48 that the polycarbonate material and the selected colorant cooperate to render the mouthpiece a color that is neither brass, gold, nor silver color, and in claim 31 that a mouthpiece bounded by a first outer periphery and a first aperture, the mouthpiece being fabricated by molding a mixture of polymer material and selected colorant material into a blank having a second outer periphery and a second aperture, and by performing a primary machining operation on the blank second outer periphery and second aperture to produce the first outer periphery and the first aperture as set forth in the claimed combination.

Art Unit: 2837

25. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shih-yung Hsieh whose telephone number is 571-272-2065. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00-3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Martin can be reached on 571-272-2107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

syh


SHIH-YUNG HSIEH
PRIMARY EXAMINER